REMARKS

In reply to the non-final office action mailed November 25, 2009, Applicants have amended claim 1 and canceled former claims 35-39 to more clearly and distinctly point out the subject matter of the claimed invention. Claims 1-12, 14-27 and 34 are pending and currently under examination. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Please consider the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 2-12 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner contends that claims 2 and 3 (upon which claims 4-12 and 14-22 are dependent) recite the variable L without reciting the definition of the variables within L making it impossible to know the structural make-up of the compounds embraced in these claims. In response, Applicants submit that claim 3 is dependent on claim 2 and claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 which adequately defines each of the variables in the L groups of claims 2-12 and 14-22. As set forth in the MPEP 608.01, "[c]laims in dependent form shall be construed to include all of the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim." *See* MPEP 608.01(i)(c). Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal and reconsideration of the above indefiniteness rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112; 1st Paragraph

Claims 34 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph as lacking enablement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the specification, while enabled for treating Parkinson's disease does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment of all or any central nervous system diseases, as embraced in the claim language.

Solely to expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the Examiner's position, Applicants have canceled former claims 36-39 and amended claim 34. Amended claim 34 now recites a method of treating Parkinsons disease in a subject.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides sufficient direction and guidance to enable one of skill in the art to carry out the methods recited in amended claim 34 without undue experimentation. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above enablement rejection.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-3, 9-12, 14-20, 26-27 and 34-39 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,285,550 (hereinafter "Vu"). Specifically, the Examiner contends that when L is the fifth choice and p1=p2=0 in the pending claims, these compounds are also claimed in claims 1-36 of Vu. Applicants traverse.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 19 of Vu teach compounds comprising monocyclic L moieties (e.g., piperazine in claim 1). In contrast, even when p1=0 and p2=0, the compounds recited when L is the fifth choice comprise a bicyclic L group wherein the X variable is either –$C(R^2)(R^3)$-, $N(R^2)$-, -O- or -S-. There is no reason to believe that the skilled artisan would select compounds comprising a bicyclic or bridged L moiety in view of the compounds recited in claims 1-36 of Vu. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claims 1-39 are patentable in view of Vu and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, which action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Catherine M. McCarty /

Catherine M. McCarty (Reg. No. 54,301)
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel.: (617) 395-7087
Fax: (617) 395-7070
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: February 25, 2010
Attorney Docket No.: B2047-7034US

949664